

REMARKS

Claim Objections:

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to Claim 8 due to antecedent basis. Applicants respectfully submit that the antecedent basis has been corrected by amending Claim 8 to depend from Claim 6, as suggested by the Examiner.

In the Office Action the Examiner objected to Claims 5-8 and 12-16 due to multiple dependencies. Applicants respectfully submit that the multiple dependencies were removed by the Preliminary Amendment filed March 1, 2005.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC§103(a):

In the Office Action the Examiner rejected Claims 1-5, 9-13, and 17-18 under 35 USC§103(a) as being unpatentable over Talley et al. (US Patent No. 5,900,516) in view of Klomp (WO 2001/77270) and Colle et al. (US Patent No. 5,583,273) as evidenced by Seiler et al. in Separation and Purification Technology Journal (2003, Vol. 30, pg. 179-197). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that there is no motivation or suggestion to combine Talley, Klomp, Colle, and Seiler as suggested by the Examiner.

In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that Seiler was published February 1, 2003, and Applicant's invention was filed as Provisional Application No. 60/407,753 on September 3, 2002. Applicants respectfully submit that Seiler is not prior art as Seiler was published after the invention and filing date of Applicants' invention.

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection to Claims 1-5, 9-13, and 17-18.

In the Office Action the Examiner rejected Claims 6-8 and 14-16 under 35 USC§103(a) as being unpatentable over Talley, in view of Klomp, Colle, Seiler, and further in view of Klomp to (EP 0824631 B1). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that there is no suggestion or motivation to

combine Talley with Klomp, Colle, Seiler, and Klomp II as suggested by the Examiner.

Further, as discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that Seiler is not prior art to the Applicants' invention. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection to Claims 6-8 and 14-16.

CONCLUSION

The Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the above amendments and remarks. Allowance of all the claims is hereby respectfully requested.

If it would be considered helpful in resolving any issues in the case, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,

RIVERS, Gordon, Thomas and
CROSBY, Daniel, Lee

P. O. Box 2463
Houston, Texas 77252-2463

By: /William E. Hickman/
Their Attorney, William E. Hickman
Registration No. 46,771
(713) 782-6082 telephone
(713) 241-6617 facsimile